DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 440 177 UD 033 471

AUTHOR Semmens, Robert A.
TITLE Full-Service Schooling, "At Risk" Students and Democratic Citizenship.
PUB DATE 1999-09-02
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the British Educational Research Association (Brighton, England, United Kingdom, September 2-5, 1999).
AVAILABLE FROM For full text: http://brs.leeds.ac.uk/cgi-bin/brs engine.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; *Alienation; *Citizenship Education; Curriculum Development; *Democracy; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *High Risk Students; Participation
IDENTIFIERS *Australia; *Full Service School Model

ABSTRACT

Currently in Australia, two school-based initiatives, "full-service" schooling and civics/citizenship curriculum, have been introduced to address two aspects of the problem of youth alienation from school and society. The "full-service" response is to provide coordinated access to health and welfare services so that "at risk" students are able to participate more fully in schooling. The civics and citizenship response teaches all students about governance so that they can participate more fully in the affairs of their community. This paper presents data suggesting that both responses will have a peripheral impact on the problem of youth alienation because they do not engage students in definition or solution of their problems. Attention is drawn to the educational limitations of the various models for implementing "full-service" schooling, and to the limitations of the civics and citizenship curriculum, which does not begin with student involvement in classroom and school governance. A recent proposal by A. Pearl and T. Knight (1999) for democratic education theory to inform classroom practice is presented as a more comprehensive approach to engaging all students constructively in defining and solving the real problems of importance to them and the future of their society. (Contains 45 references.) (Author/SLD)

Full-Service Schooling, 'At Risk' Students and Democratic Citizenship

Dr R A Semmens
Senior Lecturer
Youth Research Center
University of Melbourne

British Educational Research Association Conference
September 2, 1999

Abstract

Currently, in Australia, two school-based initiatives, 'full-service' schooling and civics and citizenship curriculum, have been introduced to address two aspects of the problem of youth alienation from school and society. The 'full-service' response is to provide co-ordinated access to health and welfare services so that 'at risk' students are able to participate more successfully in schooling. The civics and citizenship response teaches all students about governance so that they can participate more fully in the affairs of their community. This paper presents data suggesting that both responses will have peripheral impact on the problem of youth alienation because they do not engage students in definition or solution of their problems. Attention is drawn to the educational limitations of the various models for implementing 'full-service' schooling, and to the limitations of the civics and citizenship curriculum which does not begin with student involvement in classroom and school governance. A recent proposal by Pearl and Knight (1999) for democratic education theory to inform classroom practice, is presented as a more comprehensive approach to engaging all students constructively in defining and solving real problems of importance to them and to the future of their society.

Full-Service Schooling, 'At Risk' Students and Democratic Citizenship

Introduction

This paper discusses recent attempts in the USA and Australia to implement co-ordinated health and welfare services in some schools ('full-service schooling') as a strategy for increasing participation and retention rates of all students, especially those who are likely to leave early ('at risk' students). In the light of simultaneous introduction of curriculum for democratic in schools, the question is asked whether ' full-service schooling' may contribute to the development of a sense of democratic citizenship at school and in the wider community.

For the purposes of this paper, democratic citizenship is defined in similar terms to the definition of Freeman Butts, author of the CIVITAS curriculum in the USA (as cited in Pearl and Knight, 1999, p. 95), as follows:

> a democratic citizen has a reasoned commitment to the fundamental values of democratic governance and employs those values in interaction with all other individuals and groups in society.

To investigate the question on the relationship between 'full-service schooling' and democratic citizenship, three models for 'full-service' schooling are analysed for their capacity to encourage students to become citizens in a democratic society. Some limitations of each model are outlined. It is also claimed that the civics and citizenship curriculum is limited in its capacity to encourage democratic citizenship in that, while it teaches 'what active citizenship can be' (Hirst, 1997), it does not teach the 'how' of active citizenship. To clarify this criticism, an experiential model for teaching democratic citizenship is proposed and its applicability to both 'full-service schooling' and civics and citizenship curriculum, is explained.

'Full-Service Schooling'

The term 'full-service' originated in the United States to refer to schools or school districts which have access to a full range of education, health and welfare services (Dryfoos, 1994). The idea of 'full-service' schooling appears to have gained momentum as one response to the fragmentation of some communities for various reasons, including the pace of technological change, high levels of unemployment, and the attendant problems of youth alienation. Co-ordination and integration of health and welfare service provision is seen as a strategy for prevention and/or reduction of current problems facing many young people and their schooling, problems such as homelessness, drugs, violence, self-esteem, apathy, and emotional disturbance. Schools or school districts have come to be the sites of 'full-service' provision because all young people must attend school for ten years and because schools are usually conveniently located for community access.

In the United States, 'full-service' schooling may vary according to the services available in each school district and the needs of the students in each district. Common elements of full-service programs include: a commitment to better learning outcomes for all students; strengthening links between home, school and community; democratic school governance that includes parents, students and teachers; community participation and ownership of the program; co-ordination between providers and agencies; involvement of local government, local employers, local health and welfare services etc; involvement of various community groups such as service clubs, retired people, unemployed people; in-service for teachers, parents and community workers; training of parent and student advocates; and, inclusion of other social justice initiatives such as legal advice and delinquency prevention (Australian Centre for Equity Through Education, 1996).

In Australia, at present there is growing interest in the concept of 'full-service' schooling and many 'full-service' programs employ Catalano and Hawkins' (1996) social development model (Tyler and Stokes, 1999). Catalano and Hawkins draw on theories of delinquency causation, principally Hirschi's (1969) social control theory and later refinements of it such as Elliott, Huizinga and Ageton's (1985) integrated theory of social bond. Catalano and Hawkins provide evidence for the differential influence of socialisation units at different phases of social development - preschool, elementary school, middle school and high school. It is postulated that these phases are separated by major transitions in the environments in which children are socialised and shifts in the balance of influence among socialising units of family, schools, peers and community according to the age of the child. For example, family is most influential with younger children whereas peers have strong influence in the middle school years. Transitions, with their accompanying new bonding processes, offer an opportunity to decrease antisocial behaviour traits which may have been emerging in the preceding phase. Alternatively, these traits may increase due to weak prosocial development in an earlier phase and/or inadequate intervention strategies during the transition period.

According to Catalano and Hawkins, antisocial behaviour has three sources: low levels of prosocial bonding resulting in few internal constraints against antisocial behaviour; situations in which the risk of detection by valued prosocial others is low; and, when a child is bonded to immediate socialising units of family, school, community or peers who hold antisocial beliefs or values.

Development of attachments and commitments to the prosocial world depends on the extent to which prosocial involvements and interactions are positively reinforced by significant others. By contrast, those who experience few rewards for prosocial interaction and involvement have high levels of early risk factors such as: poor grades at school, low social status, and lack of access to prosocial leadership roles.

The influence of prior bonding and behaviour on future behaviour suggests the importance of intervening early in the development of antisocial behaviour, and targetting the primary socialising units operative at that phase of schooling. Regardless of stage, the socialising processes are seen to be the same: perceived opportunities to participate in activities within the social unit; amount of interaction with others; extent of positive reinforcement of involvement and interaction; and, emotional, cognitive and behavioural skills for involvement and interaction which enhance reinforcements and perceptions of reinforcement.

Interventions which focus on the social contexts of family, school and community are claimed to strengthen 'protective factors' and weaken 'risk factors' thus increasing the 'resilience' capacity of the child in resisting pressures towards antisocial behaviour. Further, it is claimed that strengthening one protective factor will strengthen the effect of another protective factor and reduce the potency of risk factors. So, for example, strong family bonds will reduce the potency of bonds to drug-taking peers, as indicated in Diagram 1.

Diagram 1
The Social Development Model

	Risk Factors	Protective Factors
Individual	Low self esteem Low motivation Low academic performance Disruptive behaviour	Early identification
Family	Fragmented Disturbed parent/child relationships High mobility Low income	Training in effective parenting Integrated services Parent/school partnerships
Peers	Negative relationships Antisocial behaviour	Student participation programs
School	Repressive discipline Large class size Unstimulating curriculum Passive learning/teaching Competitive exam-based assessment	Early focus on literacy competence Interactive, co-operative teaching/learning High expectations School-wide welfare program
Community	Extreme poverty Neighbourhood dis-organisation	Integrated service provision Involvement of supportive

Anti-social norms indivs./agencies

While the social development model provides a clear framework and direction for action in relation to prevention and remediation of student social development needs, it does not appear to have a clearly stated view of how social development may contribute to a notion of citizenship and there is no statement about the expected educative role of the 'full-service' intervention. The preference for inclusive teaching strategies to strengthen 'protective factors' does not necessarily contribute to an educative goal. As Knight (1999) asks: 'Inclusive for What?' Perhaps the strengthening of 'protective factors' through inclusive teaching strategies will enable students 'at risk' to participate more fully in the life of the school. However, literature on the 'hidden' curriculum of schools (Swann, 1983) suggests that the way students are 'processed' by the school influences the way they see themselves in relation to other students and whether they are valued differently by the school and its staff. If 'full-service' schools identify particular students as 'at risk', and therefore in need of social development strategies, such students may see themselves as of lower status than other students, that is, second class citizens, and hence the social development aims of the program may be undermined by its differential manner of delivery.

On the other hand, the emphasis of the social development model on social context 'protective factors' may minimise the identification of particular individuals and differentiate that model from other more clinically-oriented approaches that stress measurement of 'risk factors', labelling the bearers of those characteristics as 'at risk' students who are then placed in special individualised programs outside of the mainstream curriculum, and possibly in special schools (Semmens, Stokes and Downey 1998). The model for such clinically oriented programs is outlined in Diagram 2, as follows:

Diagram 2
Individual Development Model

Identification and labelling of individual 'deficits' (risk factors) through clinical assessment of special needs - education, disability, health, personality, behaviour.

Prescription of remedial, compensatory or other individually tailored program by specialist teachers, social workers, psychologists, and/or medical professionals in mainstream schools or segregated settings.

Re-assessment of performance in diagnosed deficit areas at stated intervals and reporting of level of improved functioning.

Programs derived from the individual development model rely on someone in authority to arrange for a problem to be diagnosed and treated, and for the client's functioning to be at least observably improved in the diagnosed deficit or risk area. Sometimes the individual development model is called 'the medical model' (Lewis, 1989), because it has similarities to hospital procedure of diagnosis and treatment, followed by a healthy return to family and friends. A problem with this approach is that schools are not hospitals. Rather, they are competitive socialising agencies over a period of at least ten years, so there is potential for damage to personal reputation by being labelled an 'at risk' student and consequent allocation to second class citizen status in the school peer group.

Another problem with the individual development model is that, while there may be measurable improvement in the diagnosed 'risk' area in the short term, the context for the improved functioning is not necessarily addressed in the 'hospital' environment of the treatment program. Context change is not part of the model. The individual is a client and his/her citizenship status is not relevant to the focus of the intervention. The client gets well/adjusts/achieves progam goals and is presumably more able to participate in the life of the school. However, ascription of a negative label such as 'slow learner', or 'disturbed' can be isolating rather than inclusive in the life of the school (Tomlinson,).

Because of the popularity of the individual development model for most of this century, notably in the growth of the special education sector (Lewis, 1989), Catalano and Hawkins' social development broadens traditional practice from its focus on remediating personal risk factors to include an emphasis on strengthening protective or pro-social bonding factors as well. However, Catalano and Hawkins' confidence in the protective potency of social bonds, is itself under challenge, at the macro level, by the growing evidence of fragmenting social institutions in this postmodern era (Beck, 1998) and this issue will be elaborated later in this paper.

Catalano and Hawkins may also be challenged at the micro level in schools where social bonding is not well-developed. In such schools, student health and welfare are not integrated with school curriculum, school management and community context. The lack of protective factors in those schools may leave some students exposed to identification as 'at risk', with consequent negative labelling and further weakening of social ties. It may be that Catalano and Hawkins do not go far enough. Given the dangers of risk factors becoming labels attached to vulnerable individuals, why emphasise risk factors at all? Why not concentrate on 'protective factors'? Such a focus would seek to bring the community into the school, possibly adopting a community development

model for program delivery. This is evident in some full-service schooling projects (Semmens and Stokes, 1997; Stokes and Tyler, 1998) where 'risk factors' are not the primary motivation for the project, and in some cases the projects are student initiated in response to student definition of problems.

A community development model starts with a general concern about student alienation from school and conventional society and moves to encourage young people to gradually take more and more responsibility for identifying personal care and connection needs, with a view to developing greater understanding of how various aspects of the social system work, and particularly the service system, and eventual perception of self as a contributor to that system, or even an active change agent of the system. This educative goal of community development works in much the same way as in the teaching of literacy with a view to children increasing their competence in reading and writing to the point where they can choose to contribute to the culture through critical analysis, and possibly ultimately creating their own publishable prose, poetry or plays.

A community development model accepts that, in crisis situations, someone with specialist expertise must step in and take clinical responsibility for the client in the short term. However, a community development model does insist that this intervention be connected with the rest of the client's life. Connection or re-connection may be achieved through integration of service delivery to mainstream community schools, that is 'full-service', but it is the process for the establishment of those services and the strategies for connection that make the community development model more preventive in orientation than the individual development model and the social development model. Unlike the other two main models for full-service schooling, the community development model involves students in the definition of the problem and ownership of the processes for solution, and seeks to integrate the intervention program with the education goals and curriculum of the school.

Diagram 3 presents the steps in a community development model in relation to the problem of student alienation.

Diagram 3
Community Development Model

Problem Definition	Student alienation from school
Structure and processes for community development solution	Inclusive curriculum Supportive classroom climate Student involvement in decisions about themselves

	Student access to co-ordinated self-help services Student participation in school governance Student initiated activities in school and community. Negotiated involvement of community agencies - eg employment, recreation, accommodation etc. Networking with, between and across community agencies
Expected Outcomes	Increased attendance, participation and retention rates. Connection to, and membership of, an increasing range of community agencies. Engagement with interested members of the community.

The community development model invites educationists to see school-community interaction as the basis for strengthening participation of young people in the life of the community, thus reducing the degree of isolation related to the sense of being different which results in allocation to the 'at risk' category. It is this vision of the student as an interdependent member of the school and wider community that drives the strategy for student involvement in decision-making about support services, and other issues of importance to students, from the earliest possible age.

The community development model's emphasis on including all students in the life of the school community as equal citizens appears to offer the basis for teaching democratic principles through school practices and procedures, although the model itself appears to be more concerned about social inclusion than achieving any specific educational goals. However, the model is probably in a stronger position to answer Knight's question: 'Inclusion for What?', than it is to answer questions about its concept of 'community'. Strengthening bonds to community institutions could be a nostalgic dream in a globalised world where old notions of community cohesion are increasingly challenged by market forces. The community development model assumes that social institutions are in good order and that strengthening connections is simply a matter of investing time in networking school-community relationships. Giddens (1998) casts doubt on the validity of the 'in good order' assumption when he refers to:

> The dissolution of the 'welfare consensus' that dominated in the industrial countries up to the late 1970's, the final discrediting of Marxism and the very

> profound social, economic and technological changes that helped bring these about (p.vii).

Giddens is optimistic that local communities can be renewed, centering on a differently defined concept of the family as the basic democratic unit, rather than the neo-liberal preference for restoring the male-dominated image of the successful family unit of the 1950's. Similarly, Giddens predicts that other social institutions will not disappear but evolve in more democratic forms. The role of government in the re-emergence of community is to support local movements and enterprises. Giddens provides some recent examples of global organisations, such as Shell petroleum, changing their practices to conform to local concerns about pollution and environmental degradation.

Beck (1998) is not so optimistic about people power when he claims that it is not 'merely' students who are 'at risk' in the globalised market economy, but Western democracy, for:

> only when people have a decent place to live and a secure job can they function as citizens who embrace democracy and make it come alive .... Market fundamentalism ... is a form of democratic illiteracy (p. 58).

Recent protest demonstrations at the World Trade Organisation meeting in Seattle (*The Age*, 3.12.99) may support Giddens view over Beck, although protest is not a characteristic unique to democratic countries.

What this discourse suggests for this paper is that, in all three models for 'full-service' schooling, there appears to be a lack of contextual understanding of the problem of students 'at risk', as well as a lack of confidence in an educational solution. Indeed the globalisation of the economy suggests that 'at risk' may apply on a much wider scale than envisaged by Catalano and Hawkins' 'risk factors'. On the other hand, it is unclear from Giddens work just how schools and students might participate in the evolution of social institutions in more democratic forms, particularly in school systems of the UK, USA and Australia which have adopted very competitive market approaches to school management in recent years. (Marginson, 1997; Parsons, 1999). How will young people learn the democratic processes that will assist them in developing a sense of local identity, even national identity? This is an important question for it is their generation that will have to take responsibility for renewing social institutions in ways that give people a sense of identity and belonging in a vastly different world. The evolution of democratic society may depend on schools teaching students how to make those connections.

Parsons (1999) claims that in countries where market management strategies have been introduced, such teaching will only occur in schools which have staff who are so committed that they will put in extra hours year after year because social development has now been marginalised by a narrowed definition of standards and what counts as student performance. Parsons goes on to claim that cognitive curriculum studies in civics and citizenship have been introduced as a remedial strategy for social exclusion in schools, but that such studies merely replace the previous 'civilising' style of school management

which promoted student attachment in an affective way through social relationships rather than formal curriculum.

Parsons adds to the gloomy outlook for young people. His views need to be tested against the evidence of the introduction the new civics and citizenship curriculum in Australia. Perhaps Knight's question; 'Inclusion for What?', could have been: 'Is Inclusion Possible?', and perhaps Giddens is over-optimistic in claiming that democratic society can be renewed.

The Civics and Citizenship Curriculum

In Australia, students appear to believe that political knowledge is 'a big turnoff' (Gunn, 1996) and for a long time appear to have had no idea what it would take to connect it to their personal lives (Australian Electoral Office, 1983). Government concern about this issue has been expressed in the development of a national civics and citizenship curriculum called *Discovering Democracy*, The expectation of the civics and citizenship curriculum is that knowledge about democratic governance will enable young people to participate in the democratic processes of their country. There are recommendations about how the new civics and citizenship content can be integrated with existing school subjects at each level of schooling, and implemented in 1999, just over four years after the government appointed Civics Expert Group reported that:

> Only 19 per cent of people have some understanding of what Federation meant for the Australian system of government. Only 18 per cent know something about the content of the Constitution. Only 40 per cent can name the two Federal houses of parliament, and only 24 per cent know that senators are elected on a state-wide basis. Sixty per cent have a total lack of knowledge about how the Constitution can be changed, despite having voted in referendums. Only 33 per cent have some knowledge of the rights and responsibilities of citizens; for most, citizenship is an abstract concept which is never given much thought.

The report goes on to claim that the education system has not laid a foundation of knowledge about the structure, functions and origins of Australian government, and that 15 - 19 year olds are the least knowledgeable group in the community because civics is no longer a formal part of the curriculum. The Report recommends that students be taught about Australian government, the Australian Constitution, Australian citizenship and other civic issues. The Report further recommends that these studies be integrated with one of the existing key learning areas called Studies of Society and the Environment (SOSE), stating that this key learning area:

> ranks with English and mathematics as a priority for school education, and is an essential component of a liberal education (p57).

The integration recommendation suggests that the Report's authors believe that 'good citizens' need to know not only how our system of government works but also how this knowledge relates to other aspects of life in Australian society.

The Report also lists specific values and attitudes of a 'good citizen', which are listed as follows:

> civility and respect for the law;
> acceptance of cultural diversity in society;
> individual initiative and effort;
> appreciation of Australia's record of achievements as a democracy;
> appreciation of the importance of democratic decision-making ;
> concern for the welfare, rights and dignity of all people; and,
> recognition of the intrinsic value of the natural environment (p.56).

There is some evidence that young people already score highly on at least some of these items. The 1995 Report of the Western Australian Constitutional Committee contains the results of a survey of 800 year 7 and year 11 students in that State. The students were asked to rank 26 characteristics of a good citizen. The top ten characteristics came out as follows:

1. respects the rights of others;
2. respects the property of others;
3. treats people equally regardless of their gender;
4. is honest;
5. treats people equally regardless of disabilities;
6. treats people equally regardless of race;
7. drives and rides safely;
8. acts to protect the environment;
9. treats people equally regardless of their age;
10. treats people equally regardless of their religion.

It appears that these young people have a strong commitment to social responsibility but it is also quite clear that the young people are relatively uninterested in the area of governance as a characteristic of a good citizen. The young people ranked the statement: 'is well informed about Australia's Constitution', close to the bottom of their rankings, at number 24; and, at number 25 was: 'is well informed about Australia's political system'. These young people do not seem to have made a strong connection between knowledge about governance and the Civic Experts' conception of good citizenship. Nor do they appear to connect career aspirations with the Civic Experts' conception of good citizenship as shown by the ranking at 26 of the statement : 'is successful in their career', that is, at the very bottom of their list of good citizen characteristics. This does not necessarily mean that these young people lack career ambition, simply that they do not associate such ambition with their conception of a good citizen. There appears to be a gap between these Western Australian young people and the Australian Government's economic objective for schools to produce highly skilled graduates who will make Australia internationally competitive.

Beck (1998) has an alternative explanation of the unconventional political behaviour of young people in the Western world which may be helpful in explaining the responses in the Western Australian study:

> They are an actively unpolitical younger generation because they take the life out of the self-involved institutions and thus force upon them the Hamlet question: to be or not to be? This western version of 'antipolitics' (Gyorgy Konrad), which also opens up the opportunity to enjoy one's own life with the best conscience in the world, is supplemented and made credible by a self-organised concern for others which has broken free from large institutions (p5).

Beck claims that this situation has come about because major political parties lack commitment to solving issues that are important to young people such as: unemployment ('the death of hope'), global environmental destruction, and the threat of AIDS.

> Ultimately, one can spare oneself the detour through membership meetings and enjoy the blessings of political action by heading straight to the disco (p5).

Beck claims that, in Germany, those young people who do want to get involved go to Greenpeace rather than to the major political parties.

There is additional Australian evidence that young people have different priorities from those of government as they make the transition to adulthood. Dwyer and Wyn's (1998) study demonstrates that while Australian government provision of education, training and social security still assumes a 'linear pathway' from school to further study, work, marriage, homemaking and child rearing, the experience of young people tends to be increasingly different. With the current high youth unemployment rate, more than thirty per cent in some areas (Dusseldorp, 1999), changes in the Australian economy and consequent stresses on family relationships, large numbers of young people may be negotiating casual work, part-time study, accommodation and personal relationship issues all at once. Dwyer and Wyn conclude that a concept of 'multiple pathways' may be more appropriate for explaining the transition to adulthood for large numbers of young people.

Ball et al (1999) provide corroborating data from their English study. They identify at least four typical transition patterns from school to adult citizenship, and it is clear that the linear pathway is for a reducing proportion of young people. The other three patterns are problematic as Ball et al observe:

> Students either internalise the labels generated around GCSE performance or seek to define themselves in terms of alternative, resistant but sometimes destructive life styles and selves. For many 'the realities' of GCSE performance destroy tentatively held aspirations: the differentiation of routes and 'spaces' are reproductive of social class divisions.

As with Dwyer and Wyn, Ball et al are concerned that the final years of school are geared to one pathway - the linear pathway - which is not relevant to many young people's life situation, learning needs or job opportunities. Ball et al's 'typical patterns of transition' appears an appropriate way of summarising the post-school experience of some groups of young people, although even that does not convey the degree of personal isolation and confusion about the future felt by many other young people portrayed in their case studies. Some seem to be in caught in a maze of semi-possibilities and impossibilities for their future.

In the USA there appears to be a pre-occupation with skilling for the marketplace. Beginning with the *Nation at Risk* Report in 1983, there has been on-going pressure on the US Government from business to pursue higher academic standards at school in order to raise the performance of the nation in economic competition. According to Levin (1998) the underlying assumption of the prescribed standards is that specific skill outcomes, as opposed to more years of schooling or more degrees, will increase productivity, despite the lack of research evidence that there is a link between academic standards and subsequent workplace performance of individuals. In countries where there has been extraordinary economic growth, this has been primarily due to massive economic investment, not the quality of their education systems. Levin regrets that the standards movement has not addressed the issue of cultivating citizenship in a democracy. Giroux (1999) makes a similar observation in discussing the exclusionary effects of the increased involvement of the private sector in public schooling:

> There has been a shift from responsibility for creating a democracy of citizens to producing a democracy of consumers (p 146).

It appears that in some ways schools may be contributing to youth alienation whilst at the same time they are introducing programs from outside the school aimed at reducing the problem. Ogbu (1990) observes that many young people are resistant to the competing external remedial pressures on schools to make them fit into a society offering them few incentives. In a peer culture that takes a short-term view of life, poor school outcomes for some may work against others trying to succeed, crime frequently offers a more direct economic incentive and violence can preserve self-respect. Lerman (1996), comments:

> Performing well in school does not clearly translate into better jobs. The link between school and careers is largely absent for the vast majority of high school students.

In Australia, Knight (1997) also draws attention to the problematic situation of young people making the transition from school to destinations beyond the school. He refers to the problem of high youth unemployment rates and also cites evidence from several other perspectives: the school as a marketplace; school dropout data; the interface between schooling and youth culture; and, changes in definition and management of student behaviour problems. Knight concludes that the school itself may contribute to the disengagement of many young people from conventional social institutions, including government. Knight claims that the increasing drop-out rate from secondary schooling is partly due to the exclusionary pressures of competitive selection and partly due to fear of being a 'loser' in the highly competitive final years of school, leaving many students with few options in the high youth unemployment climate.

Just as serious is Knight's claim that there has been no educational response to the problem of disruptive student behaviour. Once the problem was taken out of the classroom and 'resolved' by the school principal, possibly in a physical way with the strap. Now the problem tends to be sent out of the school

altogether or handed over to another profession for diagnosis and treatment. Knight concludes that 'slouching towards centralised management theories and pharmacological solutions', has resulted in increased problem behaviour. Students feel controlled and powerless, forcing them to take risks in dealing with their problems. Knight laments the lack of an educational response:

> As the school narrows the opportunity for students to learn democratically responsible behaviour, where it lacks these resources, then students can be expected to drift towards other affiliations. Schools have surrendered much of their power through concentrating on discipline and management to the exclusion of a general school ethos (p89).

The Australian data on school to post-school destinations have close similarities to those from the UK (Ball et al, 1999), the USA (Levin, 1998; Giroux, 1999; Ogbu, 1990; Lerman, 1996) and Europe (Beck, 1998), and suggest that there is little in the school and life experience of many young people that will encourage them to understand the relevance to their lives of the Australian Government's citizenship curriculum aim :

> To enable students to understand the way we govern ourselves, and to think of themselves as active citizens (*Discovering Democracy*, p. 9).,

This is not to dispute the citizenship curriculum aim itself, but to suggest that some progress may be made towards achieving the aim if the curriculum were to acknowledge how young people are defining their experience of citizenship at present. *Discovering Democracy* is limited in this regard. While it has a strong emphasis on how democratic government works in Australia and how democratic government differs from other forms of governance now and in the past, it has a relatively minor role for student perspectives. While it takes an educational approach to one aspect of youth alienation, that is government, it does not relate the central focus of its youth alienation concern to other issues contributing to youth alienation. Of the four themes in the *Discovering Democracy* curriculum (Who Rules?; Law and Rights; The Australian Nation; and Citizens and Public Life) only the last one, 'Citizens and Public Life', attempts to link the curriculum directly to the community living experience of young people.

The civics and citizenship curriculum may have evolved differently if it had started with 'Student Citizens in the Life of the School Community', because for many young people it appears that learning the basics of democratic governance may need to start much closer to home than learning how and why to vote in national elections. The basics for these young people may need to be understood more clearly through their experience of classroom governance and school governance (Holdsworth, 1999)

A Comprehensive Educational Response - Constructing Democracy at School

To begin, it may be helpful to look for ways in which young people can interact constructively with the school. What is attempted here stems from a basic assumption that if the school is the major social institution, outside the family,

for bringing young people to adult citizenship, then a major part of the socialisation role will take place in classrooms through formal teaching of curriculum and through informal relationships with teachers and fellow students, which together constitute the social climate of the school.

The task is not simple. Early this century, Dewey (1916) believed it essential to teach democratic citizenship at school and there have been many other important contributors to the education for democratic citizenship debate since that time - Counts, 1932; Kilpatrick, 1936; Thelen, 1960; Rogers, 1969; Pateman, 1970; White, 1982 - to name but a few. Dewey still inspires many innovative education programs (Holdsworth, 1979-). In *Democracy and Education* (1916), Dewey claims that democracy is taught through interactive learning experiences, and the school has a key role in teaching democratic goals and processes through involving students in school governance, curriculum development and inclusive teaching strategies. Dewey recommended that the entire school be organised as a miniature community so that all students could belong, and participate in, the development of the school system and, through experience, gradually learn how to apply scientific method to improve society.

In *The Democratic Classroom* (1999), Pearl and Knight take democratic education theory into modern classrooms, relating theory to the problem of youth alienation and giving teachers and students a framework for construction of democracy in the classroom. Pearl and Knight challenge Dewey's laboratory approach by bringing society into the school and empowering students to participate in solving problems related to their own future. The classroom becomes the site for initiating change through equal encouragement of all students. Pearl and Knight claim that society keeps evolving and changing anyway, so why should students not be involved in setting the agenda for the society which they are going to inherit?

Pearl and Knight begin with the claim that democratic education is as much concerned with the growth of individuals as it is with the advance of society. For them, the purpose of education is for students to be responsible problem-solvers and for that reason, the school should be problem-centred rather than child-centred or prescribed-curriculum-centred. As an example, they claim (p.93) that if history were taught as unresolved conflict, students would be more likely to participate thoughtfully and critically in the affairs of their own society than they are under the current emphasis on history as knowledge which requires a leap of faith from knowledge of the past to citizen action in the present and future for the common good. Indeed, the increasing emphasis on gaining the competitive edge on one's peers at school in order to secure a place at university and/or the job market, tends towards re-definition of education as a private commodity rather than a public good - which is anti-democratic. In their definition of democratic education:

> Neither teachers nor students are directed to the type of future society to be created: it is not premised on the belief that it will be led by feminists or any other critics of existing society. It is not a school that sexists, racists, or homophobes enter at their peril ... Its goal is to prepare students to provide leadership for inevitable change by organising the curriculum so that students can participate in

> the debate about change .... The quality of a democratic education is not determined by the direction it takes, it is determined by the quality of the debate: the extent to which students learn to marshal evidence and build coherent cases for different positions and proposals (p55).

They state their requirements for democratic schooling for citizenship:

> 1. Knowledge should be universally provided to enable all students to solve generally recognised social and personal problems;
> 2. Students should participate in decisions that affect their lives;
> 3. Clearly specified rights should be made universally available; and,
> 4. Equal encouragement should be given for success in all of society's legal endeavours (p2).

The place to develop understanding about democracy to begin, is the classroom:

> No central mandate can determine how teachers relate to students nor can central authority dictate how ideas will be communicated. The nature of relationship in a classroom constitutes the heart of education and that is where reform can and should begin (p76).

Having established the goal of democratic education, the framework of rights, and the site for the interaction, Pearl and Knight expect a societal impact:

> Democratic education is used to solve problems that are real, not imaginary, important not trivial, difficult not easy .... There is no abstract solution to poverty, justice, violence, crime, the preservation of the environment, and so on.... For students to emerge as democratic citizens they must be able to calculate the positive and negative impact of any solution on the various individuals and groups that are affected, and on something much more difficult to define - the common good (p118).

Pearl and Knight present a vision of a democratic society and the role of the public school in giving students not only the credentials to live in that society, but with a sense of being a stakeholder in that society. They want debate about the structure and curriculum of schooling to include student perspectives, along with as many other perspectives as possible. The model is summarised in Diagram 4, below:

Diagram 4
The Pearl and Knight Democratic Model

Theory	Democratic Education Theory
Problem Definition	How to educate students in the democratic society

Change Strategy	Informing students of their civic rights and negotiating associated responsibilities
	Including all students in all decisions about themselves- informing, explaining, debating consulting using logic and evidence
	Respecting minority view and understanding how power can be used responsibly in the interests of all members of the community
	Equal provision of that knowledge necessary to solve the most important personal and social problems
	Encouragement to equal success
Delivery System	Problem-solving curriculum in public schools, with wider community involvement in problem - solving
Expected Outcomes	Sense of competence, belonging and usefulness in all students, reflected in:
	co-operative solving of real and important intellectual, vocational, cultural, and personal problems;
	increased attendance, participation and retention rates;
	reduced violence; and,
	youth taking formative roles in school and the whole range of community agencies and evolving social institutions, including legal and political.

The Pearl and Knight model gives the health and welfare concerns of 'full-service' schooling an education focus. Firstly, it strengthens the community development model in that it provides a basis in education theory and a plan

for action that begins in classrooms and gives students an active role in making the institution of schooling 'in good order' for its entire membership. Secondly, in the terms of the social development model, participation in classroom governance and problem-solving activities is 'protective' by increasing student bonding to school and peers, thereby strengthening 'resilience' to adverse situations in their lives and reducing 'at risk' factors in number and intensity.

Thirdly, there is also a potentially satisfactory outcome for adherents to an individual development model for intervention in the lives of 'at risk' students. The Pearl and Knight model does not exclude a role for experts although the context for their involvement is different. No student is denied individual treatment but the democratic education model poses the same questions for the involvement of experts in the life of the school as it does for anyone else in the school community. The questions are: what is perceived as a problem and by whom?; how is the problem defined?; what is the extent of the problem?, what is the interface between private and public aspects of the problem?; who is to be involved in solution of the problem and how?; and, how will the individual and the school community be strengthened by the proposed solution? This approach is supported by recent anecdotal evidence in relation to Indigenous Australians in which a report of the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare indicated that more doctors, medicine and check-ups were only part of the solution to the very high mortality rates amongst Indigenous people. One doctor (Rob Moodie) said:

> What I learned I guess is that you realise that why people get sick is more than a germ. It's really the social and economic determinants of health - it's whether someone has got a job, it's their educational levels and really, it's the amount of control they have over their own destiny (Gray, *The Age*, 14.8.99).

Reports from Lewis (1991, 1994) and Holdsworth (1999) indicate that quite young students can engage in the process of taking control of their own destiny, and according to Lewis, it is more likely to occur in primary schools at present, as secondary teachers seem more reticent to involve students in decision-making. Additionally, from their evaluation of 'full-service' schools, Stokes and Tyler (1997) report that students have a clearer awareness of the range and relative merits of community support agencies than their teachers.

The Pearl and Knight model requires a more fundamental re-thinking of schooling and curriculum than the authors of both 'full-service' schooling and the civics and citizenship curriculum intended. But, it does provide a creative way of meeting the concerns which gave rise to the development of those programs while reviving a vision for a democratic society in the global marketplace, and the role of schooling and students in achieving that vision. However, visions rarely become reality quickly or easily, and as Carrington (1999) points out in her article on inclusive school cultures, few teachers will have ever experienced the sort of classroom that Pearl and Knight envisage. Teachers will therefore need professional development programs that balance information with opportunity to reflect collaboratively upon current practice and how to make the transition to a more democratic approach to curriculum,

students, school manegement and community relations. Obviously there are resourcing implications as well, which means financial support, at least, from the employing authority. These implementation issues will be most difficult to negotiate in more authoritarian schools, but there seems to be agreement that current schooling arrangements contribute to the alienation of many students. Solutions are being sought , and this article suggests that current attempts have serious limitations.

Conclusion

Three models for introduction of 'full-service' schooling are analysed for their capacity to reduce the numbers of students 'at risk'. It is suggested that the traditional 'individual development' model may be least effective as a general model because of the damaging side-effects of negative labelling, and that the 'protective' aims of the social development model may be more securely implemented through a community development model. However, it was found that none of the models for 'full-service' schools is integrated with educational aims of schooling, raising the concern that student welfare may be seen as an extra-curricular issue in marketised schools. The author hoped that the new civics and citizenship curriculum would address this concern, but as that did not eventuate, and in the light of international data on the growing numbers and seriousness of the 'students at risk' issue, the Pearl and Knight model for democratic classrooms was presented as a way forward by involving students in the definition and solution of important problems.

References

Australian Centre for Equity Through Education (1996) *Equity Network*, 2, 2:1.

Australian Electoral Office, Research Report (1983) *A Qualitative Analysis of Electoral Attitudes Toward Enrolment and Voting*, Canberra: Australian Electoral Office.

Ball, S, Macrae, S, and Maguire, M (1999) Young Lives, Diverse Choices and Imagined Futures: an Education and Training Market, in Slee, R (ed) *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 3: 225-238.

Beck, U (1998) *Democracy Without Enemies*,, Oxford: Polity Press, Blackwell.

Butts, F (1998) *The Morality of Democratic Citizenship: Goals for Civic Education in the Republic's Third Century*, Calabasas, California: Center for Civic Education.

Carrington, S (1999) Inclusion Needs a Different School Culture, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 3, 3: 257-268.

Catalano, R. F and Hawkins, J. D (1996) The Social Development Model: A Theory of Antisocial Behaviour, in Catalano, R (ed), *Delinquency and Crime: Current Theories*, New York: Cambridge.

Civic Experts Group (1994) *Whereas the People: Civics and Citizenship Education Report*, Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Commonwealth of Australia (1998) *Discovering Democracy*, Carlton, Victoria: Curriculum Corporation.

Counts, G (1932) *Dare the School Build a New Social Order*, New York: Day.

Dewey, J (1916) *Democracy and Education*, New York: Free Press.

Dusseldorp, J (Chair) (1999) *Australia's Young Adults: The Deepening Divide*, Sydney: Dusseldorp Skills Forum.

Dwyer, P and Wyn, (1998) Post-Compulsory Education Policy in Australia and its Impact on Participant Pathways and Outcomes in the 1990's, *Journal of Education Policy*, 13, 3: 258-300.

Dryfoos, J (1994) *Full-Service Schools: A Revolution in Health and Social Services for Children, Youth and Families*, San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Elliott, D, Huizinga, D, and Ageton, S (1985) *Explaining Delinquency and Drug Use*, Beverly Hills: Sage.

Giddens, A (1998) *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*, Oxford: Polity Press, Blackwell,.

Giroux, H (1999) Schools For Sale: Public Education, Corporate Culture and the Citizen Consumer, *The Educational Forum*, 63, 2:140-149.

Gray, D (1999) Doctors Prescribe End to Racism, *The Age*, August 14.

Gunn, M (1996, March 23) Political Knowledge a Big Turnoff Say Teenagers, *The Australian*, p6.

Holdsworth, R (ed) (1979-). *Connect*, Journal of student participatory projects, Youth Research Centre, University of Melbourne.

Holdsworth, R (1999) Taking Young People Seriously Means Giving Them Serious Things To Do, paper presented at *Taking Children Seriously National Workshop*, University of Western Sydney, Macarthur, July 12-13.

Kilpatrick, W H (1936) *Re-making the Curriculum*, New York: Newsom.

Knight, T (1999) Inclusive Education and Educational Theory: Inclusive for What?, paper presented at the *British Education Research Association Annual Conference*, University of Sussex, 2-5 September.

Knight, T (1997) Schools, Delinquency and Youth Culture, in Borowski, A and O'Connor, I (eds), *Juvenile Crime, Justice and Corrections*, Australia: Longman.

Lerman, R (1996) Helping Disconnected Youth by Improving Linkages Between High Schools and Careers, paper presented at *the American Enterprise Institute Forum on America's Disconnected Youth: Toward a Preventative Strategy*, , Washington, DC.: The Urban Institute Press.

Levin, HM (1998, May) Education Performance Standards and the Economy, *Education Researcher*, American Education Research Association, 27, 4:4-9.

Lewis, J (1989) *Removing The Grit*, unpublished PhD Thesis, Melbourne: LaTrobe University.

Lewis, R (1991) *The Discipline Dilemma*, Hawthorn, Victoria: Australian Council for Educational Research.

Lewis, R (1994) *Codes of Conduct in Schools of the Future*, Victoria: Directorate of Education.

Marginson, S (1997) *Markets in Education*, Australia: Allen and Unwin.

Ogbu, J (1990) Minority Status and Literacy, *Daedalus*, Spring:141-168.

Parsons, C (1999) *Education, Exclusion and Citizenship*, London: Routledge.

Pateman, C (1970) *Participation and Democratic Theory*, UK.: Cambridge University Press.

Pearl, A and Knight, T (1999) *The Democratic Classroom: Theory to Inform Practice*, New Jersey: Hampton Press.

Phillips, H (1995) The Ideals of Citizenship: Perceptions of Western Australian Youth, in Print, M (ed) *Civics and Citizenship Education: Issues from Practice and Research*, Canberra: Australian Curriculum Studies Association.

Rogers, C (1969) Freedom to Learn, Merrill, Columbus, Ohio.
Semmens, R and Stokes, H (1997) Full-Service Schooling for Full Citizenship, *Melbourne Journal of Educational Studies*, 38, 2:115-130.

Semmens, R, Stokes, H and Downey, L (1998) Establishing an Integrated Service Model in the Port Phillip Cluster: An Evaluation, *Working Paper No. 17*, Melbourne University: Youth Research Centre.

Stokes, H and Tyler, D (1998) *Re-Thinking Interagency Collaboration and Young People*, University of Melbourne: Youth Research Centre.

Swann, W (1983) Curriculum Principles for Integration, in Booth, T and Potts, P (eds) *Integrating Special Education*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Thelen, H (1960) *Education and the Human Quest*, New York: Harper and Row.

Tomlinson, S (1982) *A Sociology of Special Education*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Tyler, D and Stokes, H (1999) *Evaluation of Civics and Citizenship Projects*, in progress, University of Melbourne: Youth Research Centre.

Western Australian Constitutional Committee (1995) see Phillips above.

White, J (1982) The Aims of Education Re-Stated, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Wood, G (1992) *Schools that Work: America's Most Innovative Public Education Programs*, New York: Dutton

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

UD033471

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Full-Service Schooling, 'At-Risk Students + Democratic Citizenship.

Author(s): R. A. Semmens

Corporate Source: University of Melbourne

Publication Date: British Ed. Research Assoc Conference Sept 2, 1999

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1 ↑ ☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A ↑ ☑

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B ↑ ☑

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: R A Semmens	Printed Name/Position/Title: R A Semmens, Senior Lecturer
Organization/Address: University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia 3010	Telephone: 613 9344 9648 FAX: 613 9344 9632
	E-Mail Address: b.semmens@edfac.unimelb.edu.au Date: 6.3.00

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

Acquisitions Coordinator
ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education
Center on Education and Training for Employment
1900 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210-1090

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to: